



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/082,108	02/26/2002	Antonio Serra	07040.0121	2684
7590	11/28/2003			
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P. 1300 I Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005-3315			EXAMINER SELLERS, ROBERT E	
			ART UNIT 1712	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/082,108	SERRA ET AL.	
	Examiner Robert Sellers	Art Unit 1712	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 62-132 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 62-132 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 62, 63 and 65-86, drawn to a process for molding tires wherein crosslinking is conducted at a temperature of at least 120°C for at least 3 minutes (claim 63), classified in class 264, subclass 331.12.
- II. Claims 62, 64 and 65-86, drawn to a process for molding tires wherein crosslinking is conducted at a temperature of at least 160°C for at least 10 minutes, classified in class 264, subclass 501.
- III. Claims 87-97, drawn to a tire, classified in class 152, subclass 209.1.
- IV. Claims 98-108, drawn to a tire having a carcass, a belt coaxially extended around the carcass, and a tread band coaxially extended around the belt, classified in class 152, subclass 450.
- V. Claims 109-132, drawn to a composition comprising a carboxyl groups-containing elastomeric copolymer and an epoxidized liquid organic compound, classified in class 525, subclass 119.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

The tire molding process of Invention I involves materially different molding temperatures and times from that of Invention II.

Inventions (I or II) and (III or IV) are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)).

In the instant case, the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process such as the molding and crosslinking of the tire in the presence of an organic peroxide or sulfur vulcanizing agent.

The tire of Invention III is distinct from that of Invention IV due to the materially different structural features of a belt and tread in the tire of Invention IV.

Inventions V and (I or II) are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown:

(1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product such as a method of fabricating a flexible layer in a composite.

Inventions V and (III or IV) are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as a flexible layer in a composite and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

- 1) The carboxyl groups-containing elastomeric polymers such as the Nipol EP® 1072 exemplified in Table 1 on page 23 of the specification which is an acrylonitrile/butadiene/carboxylate monomer terpolymer.
- 2) The epoxidized liquid organic compounds such as the Paraplex® G-60 epoxidized soybean oil shown in Table 1.
- 3) The presence or absence of the reinforcing filler of claims 65-67, 88-90, 99-101 and 110-112 such as the Zerosil® 1165 MP precipitated silica employed in Table 2 on page 26.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species ***within each of items 1), 2) and 3) hereinabove*** for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Currently, claims 62-132 are generic.

A reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

The reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of one of the inventions set forth on page 2 hereinabove as well as a single species for each of items 1), 2) and 3) described on page 4 to be examined, even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Upon the cancellation of claims to non-elected inventions, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

(703) 308-2399 (Fax no. (703) 872-9306)
Monday to Friday from 9:30 to 6:00 EST



Robert Sellers
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1712

rs
11/20/03